



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

Professor JEBB has done excellent service to young scholars in making his *Selections from the Attic Orators* (London and New York: Macmillan & Co., 1888) more easily obtainable in price and more convenient in some respects to use. The critical notes have been put below the text instead of being printed after it—a decided improvement. As the book has abundantly proved its usefulness, it is not needful to commend it further. Like all Professor Jebb's work, it shows on every page exquisite literary taste and admirable faculty of expression. The merely grammatical soul, however, might say here and there that Professor Jebb's felicity of phrase is a snare to him, that he renders imaginary distinctions so aptly that no one can conceive how points that are so well put should be other than real. The same narrow spirit might also think it strange that the work that has been done in the syntax of the orators since the appearance of the first edition either has not attracted Professor Jebb's attention or has been steadfastly ignored. But the cordial welcome that this Journal has always given Professor Jebb's work is in no wise chilled by these considerations, and the following more or less trifling objections now to be recorded must be set down to the interest with which the book has been reread in its present form.

P. 7, §86, *τίνων* is a form one would not have expected from Professor Jebb. P. 12, §14, and 188, §9, the distinction made between *οὐ* and *μή* in an alternative question is an old favorite of Professor Jebb's, as may be seen by consulting his *Ajax* (1869), v. 7. In —*ἢ μή* we have an 'abstract speculation'; in —*ἢ οὐ* we are called on to make a 'practical conclusion.' Oddly enough, in the very passage he cites to prove this, Dem. 20, 83, the abstract speculation is put in the form *ἢ οὐ*, the real issue is *ἢ μή*. As to the passage of Isaios, even Professor Jebb's ingenuity cannot make the difference a valid one. —*ἢ οὐ* is simply 'no or yes?' —*ἢ μή* 'yes or no?' according to the familiar rule for *οὐ* and *μή* in questions. The all too reserved note on the *Ἐρμαι* (p. 31, §34) leaves the student in the dark wherein the mutilation consisted. The history of *ὅτι*, redundant before the direct quotation, has been traced by Dr. Spieker in this Journal (V 221), and it is a matter of some interest that the passage of Andokides commented on (p. 36, §48) is one of the earliest examples. *εἰ λέξοι* (p. 38, §53) must be a misprint for *εἰ λέξει* (*λέξει*). There cannot be any considerable loss of vividness in using the fut. opt. for the fut. ind. On the same page the aor. part. (with *περιορᾶν*) is said to be stronger than the present part. 'just as to see them *murdered*' is stronger than 'to see them being murdered'; 'the aor. pictures the deed as *accomplished* while he looks on.' We will not quarrel with the expression 'strong,' though it might be said that the pres. is stronger from one point of view, the aor. from another. The point is that Professor Jebb seems to

fancy that the aor. part. is a common construction after verbs of seeing (p. 160, §23), whereas it is very rare in prose after verbs of actual perception (see my Justin Mart. Apol. I 3, 3, and Pindar Introd. Ess. cx). The chief exceptions are *περιορᾶν*, in which the negative notion may have its effect on the tense (see my note in Morris's Thuk. I, 24), and *ἐφορᾶν*, where the wish for or against may be taken into consideration. It is a pity that Professor Jebb should have lent his high authority to the loose statement that *δι' ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς* may be = *δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν* (p. 43, §28). A sharp distinction between *στερεῖσθαι* (*στέρεσθαι*) and *ἐστερηῆσθαι* (p. 51, §6) is not tenable. See Classen on Thukyd. I, 70, and my note on Pind. Pyth. 6, 22. The stereotype objection to *φῆσας* (p. 91, §22) seems to be idle (see A. J. P. IX 100). *ὥστε οὐ δύνασθαι* is not parallel to the anomalous neg. in Soph. El. 780. It is simply the regular *oratio obliqua* form (see A. J. P. VII 174), where the passage is cited among many others. The ellipsis in *εἰ μὴ διὰ Κύρον* is not *ἐσφάλησαν*, but simply the negative of the leading verb (hence here *οὐκ ἐκράτησαν*). Goodwin, to whom J. refers, is not sufficiently explicit. On p. 178, §5, we read, "*εἰ . . . ἡμφισβήτει . . . ὃν προσήκοι*, 'If he were claiming my property [which he is doing], this would [*on that supposition*] be fitting,' etc.; but *ἃν προσήκεν*, 'this would be (as it is *not*) fitting.' Cf. Dem. *De Cor.* §206, *εἰ μὲν τοίνυν τοῦτ' ἐπεχείρουν λέγειν . . . οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅστις οὐκ ἂν εἰκότως ἐπιτιμήσειέ μοι.*" To be sure, in 18, 206 we are tempted to read with Dion. Hal. and many MSS *ἐπετίμησε*, but we can make sense of the passage as a logical condition 'If I *was*,' not 'if I *were* undertaking'; and in any case the passage is not in point, for here the antithesis is not to *ἡμφισβήτει*, but to the circumstance that precedes. The whole protasis reads: *εἰ δ' ἦν ἅπαις ἐγὼ τετελευτηκῶς καὶ ἡμφισβήτει*, and the antithesis is given in *ζῶ γάρ*. Hence we must have *ἃν προσήκεν*, and not *ἃν προσήκοι*. The rare shift from the unreal protasis to the ideal apodosis is either merely apparent (the true condition being involved) or a real anakoluth. The difference between *οἷος* and *οἷός τε* might have been better put by the accomplished editor of Theophrastus (see A. J. P. VII 165). *οἷος* 'kind of' is all right, but I question 'capable' for *οἷός τε*. Elmsley's explanation of *οὐ μὴ εἰσεῖ*; would require *οὐκ οὐκ εἰσεῖ*; (A. J. P. III 205), and is not worthy of serious refutation by examples (p. 193, §24).